

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Next Retail Limited v. liang dezhong, tong xiaonian
Case No. D2026-2244

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Next Retail Limited, United Kingdom, represented by Markmonitor Limited, United Kingdom.

The Respondents are liang dezhong, China, and tong xiaonian, China.

2. The Domain Names and Registrar

The disputed domain names <loverosesuk.com> and <lovesroses.com> are registered with Dynadot Inc Dynadot Inc (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 25, 2026. On May 26, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain names. On May 27, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain names which differed from the named Respondent (REDACTED FOR PRIVACY, Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 27, 2026, with the registrant and contact information of nominally multiple underlying registrants revealed by the Registrar, requesting the Complainant to either file separate complaint(s) for the disputed domain names associated with different underlying registrants or alternatively, demonstrate that the underlying registrants are in fact the same entity and/or that all domain names are under common control. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on June 1, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondents of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on June 3, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5,

the due date for Response was June 23, 2026. The Respondents did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondents' default on June 25, 2026.

The Center appointed Andrea Mondini as the sole panelist in this matter on July 2, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a fashion retailer with a history dating back to 1864 offering clothing, footwear, accessories and homeware. It operates a network of retail stores in the United Kingdom and Ireland, as well as an international online presence. The Complainant uses its LOVE & ROSES mark as a sub-brand of its womenswear offering.

The Complainant owns numerous trademark registrations in several jurisdictions, including:

TRADEMARK	JURISDICTION	REGISTRATION NUMBER	REGISTRATION DATE	INTERNATIONAL CLASSES
LOVE&ROSES	European Union	018280430	February 18, 2021	18, 25, 35
LOVE AND ROSES	United Kingdom	UK00004059313	September 20, 2024	25, 35

The Complainant offers its LOVE & ROSES branded products under "www.next.co.uk/shop/brand-loveroses-0", on its international websites, and in its physical retail stores.

The Respondents did not file a Response. Therefore, not much is known about the Respondents.

The disputed domain name <loverosesuk.com> was registered on December 15, 2025.

The disputed domain name <lovesroses.com> was registered on June 24, 2025.

According to the evidence submitted with the Complaint, both disputed domain names resolve to a website under the disputed domain name <loverosesuk.com> prominently displaying the Complainant's trademark and featuring women's fashion content.

5. Parties' Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends as follows:

The trademark LOVE & ROSES has been extensively used to identify the Complainant and its products. The disputed domain names are confusingly similar to the trademark in which the Complainant has rights, because they incorporate a variant of this trademark. The omission of the connective element "&" in both disputed domain names, its substitution with the letter "s" in the disputed domain name <lovesroses.com>, and the addition of the geographic term "uk" in the disputed domain name <loverosesuk.com> are not sufficient to prevent a finding of confusing similarity.

The Respondents have no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain names. The Respondents have not been authorized by the Complainant to use this trademark, are not commonly known by the disputed domain names, and there is no evidence of the Respondents' use, or demonstrable preparation to use, the disputed domain names in connection with a bona fide offering of goods and services.

The disputed domain names were registered in bad faith because it is obvious that the Respondents had knowledge of both the Complainant and its well-known trademark LOVE & ROSES at the time they registered the disputed domain names.

The Respondents are using the disputed domain names in bad faith, because they resolve to a website consisting substantially of AI-generated content about women's fashion, closely modelled on the Complainant's LOVE & ROSES brand in terms of product range, visual identity and branding. This website constitutes a spam blog ("splog") that exists not to provide genuine information or services to Internet users, but rather to exploit the attractive force of a well-known mark.

B. Respondents

The Respondents did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

According to paragraph 4(a) of the Policy, in order to succeed, a complainant must establish each of the following elements:

- (i) the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the trademark or service mark in which the complainant has rights;
- (ii) the respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in respect of the disputed domain name; and
- (iii) the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith.

6.1 Consolidation: Multiple Respondents

The amended Complaint was filed in relation to nominally different domain name registrants. The Complainant alleges that the domain name registrants are the same entity or mere alter egos of each other, or under common control. The Complainant requests the consolidation of the Complaint against the multiple disputed domain name registrants pursuant to paragraph 10(e) of the Rules.

The disputed domain name registrants did not comment on the Complainant's request.

Paragraph 3(c) of the Rules states that a complaint may relate to more than one domain name, provided that the domain names are registered by the same domain name holder.

In addressing the Complainant's request, the Panel will consider whether (i) the disputed domain names or corresponding websites are subject to common control; and (ii) the consolidation would be fair and equitable to all Parties. See WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions (["WIPO Overview 3.1"](#)), section 4.11.2.

As regards common control, the Panel notes that:

- Both disputed domain names appear to target the Complainant by incorporating a variant of its LOVE & ROSES trademark;
- Both disputed domain names are registered with the same Registrar;
- Both disputed domain names use the same privacy service, namely Super Privacy Service LTD c/o Dynadot, with identical contact details;

- The disputed domain name <lovesroses.com> is configured to redirect to the website under the disputed domain name <loverosesuk.com>;
- Both disputed domain names resolve to the same website which in terms of structure, design, content, and branding, closely mirror the Complainant's LOVE & ROSES brand and website.

These circumstances indicate that the disputed domain names are subject to common control.

As regards fairness and equity, the Panel sees no reason why consolidation of the disputes would be unfair or inequitable to any Party.

Accordingly, the Panel decides to consolidate the disputes regarding the nominally different disputed domain name registrants in a single proceeding.

6.2 Substantive issues

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain names. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the Complainant's mark is recognizable within the disputed domain names.

The omission of the connective element "&" in both disputed domain names, its substitution with the letter "s" in the disputed domain name <lovesroses.com>, and the addition of the geographic term "uk" in the disputed domain name <loverosesuk.com> do not prevent a finding of confusing similarity under the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), sections 1.8 and 1.9.

The addition of the generic Top-Level Domain ("gTLD") ".com" in both disputed domain names is a standard registration requirement and as such may be disregarded under the confusing similarity test under the Policy, paragraph 4(a)(i). [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.11.1.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondents may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that for a complainant to prove that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

The Panel is mindful that the word combinations “loveroses” and “lovesroses” have a dictionary meaning. However, in the present case, the fact that the Respondents used the Complainant’s trademark on the website posted under the disputed domain name <loverosesuk.com> to offer the same type of products as offered by the Complainant clearly shows that the Respondents are not using these expressions according to their dictionary meaning, but seek to target the Complainant and its trademark.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondents lack rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names.

The Respondents have not rebutted the Complainant’s prima facie showing and have not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain names such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity, such as here, passing off as the Complainant, can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

Furthermore, the composition of the disputed domain names itself suggests a connection or implies affiliation between the Complainant and the Respondents which in fact does not exist. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.5.1

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.2.1.

In the view of the Panel, noting that the Complainant’s trademark registration predates the registration of the disputed domain names and considering that the Complainant’s trademark is well established and that the disputed domain names both resolve to a website featuring the Complainant’s trademark and depictions of women’s clothing, it is inconceivable that the Respondents could have registered the disputed domain names without knowledge of the Complainant’s known trademark. In the circumstances of this case, this is evidence of registration in bad faith.

The impression given by this website would cause Internet users to believe that the Respondents are somehow associated with the Complainant when, in fact, they are not. The Panel holds that by using the disputed domain names, the Respondents have intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users to their website, by creating a likelihood of confusion with the Complainant’s mark as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of its website in the sense of Policy, paragraph 4(b)(iv).

Moreover, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegal activity such as in the present case passing off as the Complainant constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondents’ registration and use of the disputed domain names constitute bad faith under the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy with regard to the disputed domain names.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain names <loverosesuk.com> and <lovesroses.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Andrea Mondini/

Andrea Mondini

Sole Panelist

Date: July 14, 2026